

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
FOR PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS OF THE
DIVISION OF THE STATE ARCHITECT – STRUCTURAL SAFETY (DSA-SS AND
DSA-SS/CC)
REGARDING THE 2019 CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 24, PART 1
(DSA-SS/CC 01/18)**

The Administrative Procedure Act requires that every agency shall maintain a file of each rulemaking that shall be deemed to be the record for that rulemaking proceeding. The rulemaking file shall include a Final Statement of Reasons. The Final Statement of Reasons shall be available to the public upon request when rulemaking action is being undertaken. The following are the reasons for proposing this particular rulemaking action:

UPDATES TO THE INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS:

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(1) requires an update of the information contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons. If the update identifies any data or any technical, theoretical or empirical study, report, or similar document on which the state agency is relying that was not identified in the Initial Statement of Reasons, the state agency shall comply with Government Code Section 11347.1.

The Division of the State Architect has made no updates to the Initial Statement of Reasons provided during the recent 45-Day public comment period; the Division of the State Architect did not receive public comments during the 45-Day public comment period.

MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(2), if the determination as to whether the proposed action would impose a mandate, the agency shall state whether the mandate is reimbursable pursuant to Part 7 of Division 4. If the agency finds that the mandate is not reimbursable, it shall state the reasons for the finding(s).

The Division of the State Architect has determined that the proposed regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts. The proposed regulations incorporate that DSA may charge fees to recover costs for specific services as currently allowed in the EC. These fees for services do not mandate a new program or a higher level of service as defined in the California Constitution, Article XIII B and regulated in the California Government Code, Part 7 commencing with Section 17500 of Division 4. The proposed regulations do increase fees DSA may charge to recover costs for services as allowed in the EC; however, this increase provides alignment with the 2017 Budget Bill, which was effective June 27, 2017.

OBJECTIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS MADE REGARDING THE PROPOSED REGULATION(S).

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(3) requires a summary of EACH objection or recommendation regarding the specific adoption, amendment, or repeal proposed, and an explanation of how the proposed action was changed to accommodate each objection or recommendation, or the reasons for making no change. This requirement applies only to objections or recommendations specifically directed at the agency's proposed action or to the procedures followed by the agency in proposing or adopting the action, or reasons for making no change. Irrelevant or repetitive comments may be aggregated and summarized as a group.

The Division of the State Architect did not receive any objections or recommendations regarding the proposed regulations during the recent 45-Day public comment period.

DETERMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND EFFECT ON PRIVATE PERSONS

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(4) requires a determination with supporting information that no alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed, or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provisions of law.

The Division of the State Architect has determined that no alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulations, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provisions of law.

REJECTED PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE THAT WOULD LESSEN THE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES:

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(5) requires an explanation setting forth the reasons for rejecting any proposed alternatives that would lessen the adverse economic impact on small businesses, including the benefits of the proposed regulation per 11346.5(a)(3).

The Division of the State Architect did not receive any proposed alternatives during the recent 45-Day public comment period to the proposed administrative regulations that would lessen adverse impact on small business.